REMARKS

The application has been amended and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 13 has been amended to be in independent form by incorporated claims 11 and 12 from which claim 13 previously depended. Claims 14, 15, and 18 were amended to be dependent from claim 13. As claims 14, 15, and 18 each previously dependent from one of claims 11 and 12, these claims are now narrower in scope than previously.

The amendment narrows the pending issues as the amendment does not add any claims, add any new features, or broaden any claims. Entry of the amendment is therefore appropriate and solicited.

There are no outstanding formal matters.

Claims 11-12 are rejected as anticipated by FALTINGS 2003/0033164.

Claims 13-16 and 18-19 are rejected as obvious in further view of MOGLER 2003/0110062.

Claims 17 and 20-21 are rejected as obvious in still further view of WINTER 2001/0007088.

The anticipation rejection is moot and need not be separately addressed. However, it will be noted below that FALTINGS does not include all the features found in claims 11-12.

The recited invention provides a database specifically configured, i.e., as per the step of creating a table of geographical zone types and a priority rank associating with each

geographical zone type, the priority rank associated with each geographical zone type decreasing as a function of the precision of the associated geographical zone type. This is in contrast to FALTINGS which teaches modifying the definition of input criteria for a search engine.

The recited concept of geographic zones is different from the geographical data disclosed by both MOGLER and WINTER.

See that claim 13 requires a table (see specification page 10) of geographical zone types of decreasing territorial scopes with the priority rank associated with each geographical zone type decreasing as a function of the precision of the associated geographical zone type, i.e., "a table of geographical zone types and a priority rank associating with each geographical zone type, the priority rank associated with each geographical zone type decreasing as a function of the precision of the associated geographical zone type". This table structure is neither taught nor suggested by the applied prior art.

FALTINGS fairly discloses a standard reservation system with a server and a trip information database (segments of travel). The use of market pairs in FALTINGS is the conventional input of search criteria by a user to perform a search by a search engine. This does not involve that the data within the database are rules comprising a content and criteria which comprises a market pair.

Thus, although FALTINGS describes market pairs, these pairs are disclosed as being useful for searching purposes and

not for the storage configuration. It is never suggested by FALTINGS that the database (element 12 of Figure 1) stores rules classified according to market pair definitions.

To satisfy claim 13, FALTINGS must "store the created rules in a database" where each rule comprising a criteria section containing at least one criterion used for selection of a trip, and a content section containing data corresponding to a type of information applicable to a trip, the at least one criterion in each rule being a market pair, the market pair comprising i) an origin market defining a geographic zone of departure of the trip, and ii) a destination market defining a geographic zone of arrival of the trip. Rules of this specific structure are not stored in a FALTINGS database.

As to the geographical data of FALTINGS, this geographical data is used to display the returned products. FALTINGS teaches to improve the display and not the data storage.

FALTINGS and MOGLER are said, by the Official Action, to be analogous as they are from the same field of endeavor of computer reservation systems.

However, these references are not easily combinable as MOGLER concerns yield management issues for corporate traveling which is a quite different from the display solution of FALTINGS. For frequent flyers, especially corporate travelers, companies usually have contracts with various transpiration carriers. The aim of MOGLER is to manage these contracts.

Again, geographical data (origin and destination cities) are used for classical reasons to build a travel request. Paragraphs 40 and 41 also disclose that for each carrier and for each city pair, a priority rank is given according to the contracts. This is to give a priority to each carrier in each origin/destination situation. In a nutshell, MOGLER only teaches a table of management of transportation contracts which is not the recited subject matter.

The Official Action has offered Figure 4, item #312 as illustrating the recited table structure of claim 13. Figure 4 does not show "a table of geographical zone types and a priority rank associating with each geographical zone type", Nor does Figure 4 show "the priority rank associated with each geographical zone type decreasing as a function of the precision of the associated geographical zone type".

See that each record includes a carrier (CXR), city one and city two. See that the first three records have different carriers but the same value for city one (ewr) and the same value for city two (ord). Even if city one = ewr and city two = ord were consider a geographical zone type, there would be plural ranking associated with each geographical zone type, the exact ranking being a function of the carrier.

However, even if this part of the claim were satisfied, the further recitation of "the priority rank associated with each geographical zone type decreasing as a function of the precision of the associated geographical zone type" is not satisfied.

11

There are i) no further geographic zone types that are of decreasing geographical precision and ii) no corresponding relationship as to decreasing priority rank with precision.

See that in MOGLER Figure 4 there are records 4-6 which pertain to city one = iah and city two = ord. However, this is not further geographic zone types of decreasing geographical precision. Additionally, there is no decreasing priority rank with precision.

See record 1 for carrier AA has priority 1 and record 4 for carrier AA has priority 2, whereas record 2 for carrier UA has priority 2 and record 5 for carrier UA has priority 1. Thus, even if the individual records were considered to be geographic zone types, there is no further geographic zone types of decreasing geographical precision where there is no decreasing priority rank with precision.

Thus, the features of claim 13 are clearly not taught or suggested, and the obviousness rejection fails.

SUMMARY

FALTINGS only discloses classical features in common with the invention as claimed:

- a reservation system,

- a storage of trip data,

- market pairs.

FALTINGS fails to disclose:

- the use of market pairs for creating rules each comprising a content which stores trip data

12

(FALTINGS discloses market pairs as origin and destination points used as input for a search process. The invention uses market pairs for storage purposes).

- the use of market pairs having different geographical scope. In FALTINGS, the market pairs correspond to cities of origin and destination and not to market zones to which some informations are applicable. The invention accordingly comprises various geographical zone types (airport, city, state, country, region world) which would make no sense in the context of FALTINGS.

Starting from FALTINGS, a skilled person would have had no hint for improving the trip data presentation within databases of a reservation system.

Even with this aim in mind, a normally skilled person would not have combined FALTINGS with MOGLER or WINTER. Indeed, MOGLER concerns a very specific matter (yield management within a corporate system dealing with transportation contracts). This subject has nothing to do with the invention and MOGLER is therefore not easily combinable with the teachings of FALTINGS. WINTER is for navigation purposes so that it does not directly or indirectly concern the storage of trip data. Only display issues are discussed within WINTER so that a skilled person would not have used it for improving the storage of trip data.

There is consequently no obvious possible combination of the teachings of the three documents FALTINGS, MOGLER and WINTER that results in the claimed invention.

Even by association of their teachings, the features as claimed are not reached. It is to be noted that all the cited documents use market pairs for search or display purposes and not for bringing a new way to create and handle rules concerning trip information.

Lastly, the prior art (especially MOGLER Figure 4)does not teach the recited table structure of claim 13, i.e., "a table of geographical zone types and a priority rank associating with each geographical zone type", with "the priority rank associated with each geographical zone type decreasing as a function of the precision of the associated geographical zone type".

In that the prior art does not teach or suggest the combination of claimed features, all the claims are believed allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims is therefore solicited.

Should there be any matters that need to be resolved in the present application; the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any

overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional

fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

Roland E. Long, Jr., Reg. No. 41,949
745 South 23rd Street
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573

REL/fb